FIXED FOR - 9/7/97
M 4 - (31)
Before Hon'ble Sh. Sampat Ram

BEFORE THE M.P. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: JABALPUR

O.A.No.2764/96

APPLICANT : A.K. Philip

-V/s-

RESPONDENTS : State of M.P. & others

RETURN ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS

The answering respondents, respectfully submit as under :-

1. That the applicant has filed the instant application for issuance of a direction that the C.M.O., Raipur should consider his representations which were submitted on 29/6/96, 2/7/96 and 30/7/96 in the light of Annexure A/7 and also in the light of Annexure A/1. By the instant petition, he has further prayed that the respondents 1 to 3 be directed to deal C.M.O., Raipur in accordance with law for not complying with the instructions issued vide Ann.A/7 & A/1.

2. That the entire application of the applicant being based on misconceived & misleading facts is totally devoid of any substance as would be clear from perusal of submissions made hereinbelow.

3. At the out-set answering respondents submit that the applicant has not mentioned material facts before this Hon'ble Tribunal. The answering respondents are submitting the true facts before the Hon'ble Tribunal. It is submitted that applicant was earlier transferred in the year 1985 from Rohansi to Simga vide order dt. 11/6/85. Copy of the same is annexed herewith as ANNEXURE R/1. Thereafter looking to the administrative exigencies, the then C.M.O. modified the order whereby applicant has been ~~transferred~~ posted within the Simga Block in Sector P.H.C. named Sohela. The applicant has carried-out the order and joined at Sohela.

4. It is further submitted that while the applicant was posted at Sohela, one criminal case has been

...2

(48)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 1436 OF 2005

Petitioner : Adison Kumar Phillip

versus

Respondents : The State of M.P. and others

Present : None appears for the petitioner.
Mr. V.V.S. Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General with Mrs. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the State.

ORDER
(Passed on 9th Day of March, 2007)

1. By this petition, the petitioner challenges the validity of the transfer order dated 25-5-1996 (Annexure A-1). With the passage of time, the writ petition has become infructuous, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.

2. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge